

RECEIVED
SDNY PRO SE OFFICE

2021 APR 28 PM 2:27

U.S. District Court Southern
District of New York

Civil Docket Case # 19-cv-11265

Third Amended Complaint

Freddie McDaniels

Plaintiff

against

The City of New York
Defendants

Background

I was arrested on July 14, 2015
at a intersection of 187th Street & two
officers McDaniels and C. Tolosa
at Rock Creek project corner as a lawful
pull over the automobile because
of a broken tail light, me and
another passenger left the car
and officers followed us and
arrested me for possession of
a loaded gun. I was arrested.

and indicted under 2635/2015 which was then dismissed and superseded by Ind. No. 1302/2016 after 1 month. The proceeding lasted in total for 4 1/2 years during

which ten judges who were not appointed/elected officials participated with out jurisdiction in the matter over my speed trial rights were violated. I have had the proceeding prosecutor accused possess in the case related to the grand jury proceeding, speedy trial motions for probable cause hearings, and bail hearing for no other than an improper motive. The charges against me were duplicated with an array of offenses and half were thrown out and although a "nickel DNA and a gun toss the simulation showed his innocence. After the first three months, the case against me continued. In addition, excessive bail was imposed in attempt to hold me maliciously.

But ultimately the case was dismissed for lack of probable cause.
Because of

Clarke J False Arrest & Malicious
Persecution & Due Process Negligent
Investigation

Allie M. Brooks and C. Tolino
of 33 and physical stops on a car to
pull over the automobile because of
a broken taillight are another
passenger left the car and D. Brooks
followed us leaving the driver and
passenger in the car and I can't guess
on time street while following
was detained and arrested without
consent and searched further, the
father goes on away. This was an illegal
process violating my 4th Amendment to
be free from illegal body search &
holding a criminal case in New York
Chapter 9 suppression II: searched and
seized physical evidence § 89(6)(a) was
carried stop and search of an automobile
no search unless trouble situation only
passenger (where the police stop
a vehicle to arrest the driver, Search

if a passenger must be based upon
probable cause. People v. Peeler, 10
N.Y.3d 915, 862 N.Y.S.2d 301, 392
N.E.2d 385 (2008) See *Fruit of the
unconscious type doctrine*. *Brennan v.
California*, 551 U.S. 249, 107 S.Ct. 2460,
168 L.Ed.2d 182 (2007); *U.S. v. Mosley*, 454
F.3d 249 (3d Cir. 2006) See *HCHNY* Chapter
A, *Suppression II Search and Seizure: physical
evidence*, § 9167 (car and less stop and).

Search of an automobile - *No search
of wheels, traffic stops*: only when
a vehicle is stopped for a traffic infraction
and is stopped for a crime, the extent
of intrusion is limited if a police officer
is not authorized to conduct a search.
Absent additional grounds for believing
that a crime has been committed. *People
v. Macsh*, 26 N.Y.2d 98, 281 N.Y.S.2d
789, 182 N.E.2d 783 (1962); *People v.
Bacchus*, 058 A.D.2d 369, 677 N.Y.S.2d
526 (1st Dept. 1998); *People v. Wooley*,
189 A.D.2d 828, 602 N.Y.S.2d 748 (2d
Dept. 1993); *Bacchus v. Leeser*, 526 U.S.
113, 1198, ct. 489, 142 L.Ed.2d 492.

1998). The tailight was broken and
the wasn't any corroborations or
segured as a Letter of Intent to Convene
§ 87(2)(b) NY chapter to Grand Jury
Evidence and Instuctions § 61(6)
Different evidentiary Standards see
People v. Lubell 19 NY 2d 247 946 NY 2d
56 d, 969 N.Y.2d 770 (2002) see People
v. Richards 56 AD3d 881 888 NY 2d
1025 (1st Dept 2008); People v. Brath-
waite 176 Misc. 3d 791 870 NY 2d
970 (Sup 1998). Further notice above
said that they saw Harrel's car stretched
like we both threw some thing with
out any combination requirements. Also
because this was a lie and the offi-
cial no probable cause it was entirely illegal
NYCNY chapter 9. Disposition II Search
and Seizure: Physical Evidence § 9.53
Search and Seizure of abandoned or
abused evidence - Presumption against
abandonment. There is the legal presu-
mption against abandonment if the
prosecution has the burden of proving
an intentional relinquishment of

abandonment of a known right or
privilege. The proof supporting abandonment
should reasonably befit the
exclusive inference of the following
way." People v. Howard, 50 NY 2d
583, 413 A.D. 598, 408 N.E. 2d 908
(1980) See also People v. Olarcos, 51 A.D. 2d
553, 458 N.Y.S. 2d 157 (1st Dept 1980);
People v. Licillo, 78 A.D. 2d 1424, 40 NY
S. Ed. 272 (3 Dept 2010). The police
began chasing the defendant without
any reason. While running away, the
defendant threw aside a gun that the
police later recovered. Suppression of gun
was granted because the defendant's
action was "a provoked and spontaneous
reaction to the unlawful police
conduct." People v. Torre, 15 App. 2d
96, 409 N.Y.S. 2d 790 (1st Dept 1986). This
shows us that since the arrest is illegal
and officers had no probable cause
to arrest. Also that I wife was detained
for 3 days in involuntary.

After my arrest I was accused
and indicted with out any genuine
jury confrontation evidence by
Officer - 110419 from and a half year. I
was prosecuted with out probable
cause by prosecution because the
Investigation revealed a video showing
I did not discharge the weapon,
plus a gun tape simulation, and DNA
that establishes my innocence further
more that the case could not be tried.
I was released after I heard a lawyer
the case went to a machine gun
hearing in which the gun was supposed
from Hwy 99:6 9:46:7,9:53,56 effect.
Both officers and prosecution acted
under color of law and prosecuting
and accusing me for 4 1/2 years
with out probable cause violating my
Due Process Clause 5th and 14th Amend-
ments. I firmly the cause was planned
in my favor.

I agree I am being denied Due process
Conditions of Containment Orders

I was arrested without probable
cause, inventory for a county
year. I spent 95 day between
my arrest and bail posted on
Offense - Offense: ~~1635 - 03/09/15 -~~
~~11/04/19~~ on two cases, 1302/2016
and 1303/2016. My bail was high
because of the A-B class violent
felony of possession of a in the
1st class and was supposed to
be released for my second case
before and after the bail setting
Court allowed me to be confined
during the case couldn't be
tried back during interpretation
issues, D.N.A. test and a lack of
probable cause. There was a major
Due process violation concerning my
second trial from issues that arose
from indictment 1635/2015 and
1302/2016 and also the fact that
Probation commitment paper to be detained)

by the department of correction My
right trial has been effective its so violated
as charges for gangs that all didn't have my
QKA on them one died with 15 other
except one who they didn't arrest that
was shown through them on camera
All the above I spent 10 months
as a detainee my conditions of
confinement were very cruel
and unusual dies a period of 26 days
~~months~~ I was subject to case
high and low temperament because
the Daniels is out side the main
building we were with all four
end at the Sunnyside and some
times they were taken and out
much head in the winter I was
especially threatened by officers and
inmates they caused to violently
harass and steal from me a few
hundred dollars want privilege from my
account and no reply from grievance
more over I was subjected to
necessary strip search if my
housing inaccurate we were

Passed to strip search of other
officers order is noted I was in
a Louis Clark civilian housing area
due to my classification policy
Says we are allowed a base number
of search a month and its free
to search 2-4 times a week this is
a violation of my Amendment
and I demand it really
a place to a regular here with
many hazardous contact with
bad diseases like: ~~gastro~~ ~~gastro~~ HIV,
Covid-19.

Above Of Process Claims
Conspiracy Claims

Officer arrested me illegally, but saying there was no broken tail light in a car I was a passenger in when stopped we were legally pulled over. There was no broken tail light even ticketed for one such violation gave the process of being pulled over was for a search and goods, that an arrest was made, it happened eight we are violated. Also officers had held arresting me for no a while they had this motives because I told them who had the gun.

The gun they was allowed to conduct with out corroborating statements by the same officer of street come call body camera to settle question of law. Due process was violated to hide piracy by officers books and bills and was allowed to put some one in jail because the

Poured guns on the Street whether
the officers or prosecution had
the right person or not in the
interest of justice.

The process of holding violated
under the 8th amendment because
my bail was high and impossible
for them to keep me in jail for a
higher success rate of conviction by
not allowing me to create my
perfect defense and keep working
to pay my lawyer.

My case violated one under
302(h)(6) all the while have
evidence that proves my innocent-
ce and know the cases couldn't
be quickly because they were stalling
to use scare tactic making
misinformation and placing me at
the persistent felony 5-15 years and
many 10 years of the case offered
5 years that with another time in
an attempt to have an innocent man
plead guilty to years in jail Due
process 5th amendment was clearly
violated.

All of each process at Court in
which my right were violated
shows a disregard of malice
between my lawyer taken my
money and Pleasing the Court
for illegal plea offering from them
the judge and Prosecutors under
Second Felony offende States My
lawyer took beneath and money
from me for a DNA that we
never did and the government
possessed by officer of Court to
do a DNA test.

My Trial claim > Denial of Speech
trial > Motion > Officers Not available
changed/recessed grant my (pre) trial hearing

My Speech trial rights were violated
because my time was calculated wrong,
motion pre-argument to the case was
stamped and recognized and the
correct motion went heard after
my lawyer adopted them. More over
my Due process 5th and 14th Amendment
were violated under color of law.

All evidence was gathered in the first
month of Sept. Then I was
indicted which doesn't stop my
Speech trial sessions 30.30.0(a) took
place after the preliminary testimony all
gathered in Wicks, All previous motion
preliminary hearing and ultimately my
case didn't become eligible till more
than Month between indictments
26.33/2015 and 1302/2016, the case
ended 1/04/19.

My final 30.30.0(a) motion prepared
by my lawyer went congruent to

My case because that is what happened
of them too specifically trial and I have
a felony case Court acted maliciously
in recognizing this motion with
motion without prosecution by
putting it on the record. Also acts of
mails were evident because my
Public 30.26(6)(a) motions were
recognized after being adopted by
my Lawyer. After only 149 were
read then the motion was heard
but never add to the record and
stamped by court. A year passed and
my 30.26(6)(a) motion (by one) was not
read, or get an answer.

On May 11th Officer Beacon Brooker
was impersonate by another officer
said Brooker came before I was
allowed to testify in court that officer
Brooker wasn't present.

Also My grand jury and probable
cause hearing transcripts were charged
stamped without court authorizing it
to be recorded.

Disposition Of Bail Claim

My case lacks probable cause and the secondary lack sufficient minutes to prove that the car will stop from breaking tail, without officers (unconscious statements/evidence) from the infliction of major injury hearing minutes. My charges were duplicated with all orally of other officers and half were thrown out, with no charge in bail. More over video, D.N.R and a gun testing Smeltingo showed my innocence after the first 3 months of assignment and the case lacked jurisdiction because it could be tried/ or competence. My case went to trial and then was reset back down to secondary under a succeeding indictment number 302-2016.

Damages

I am various claims I am seeking
monetary damages from Compactoray Inc. for
Specified and Punitive Damages. The
emotional / mental / humiliatinig distress,
lack of, discrimination, physical injury,
detonation / loss of employment
opportunities, injury to reputation,
injury to reputation, legal cost in defending
the criminal action, transportation, because
legally / legally Ceased by my arrest or
imprisonment suffered by him during the
course of the procedure, psychiatric
treatment, personal animosity, injury
reckless disregard of my rights,
Constitutional compensation, and loss
of wages because of the procedure,
arrest, capsicay, and imprisonment.
Moreover, denial / discharge of
employment / denied and unusual
punishment / violation of my
constitutional rights with tons of
malice. I'm asking for 100,000.00

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 60 of 94

Levin, Benjamin

From: Levin, Benjamin
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2019 5:11 PM
To: 'Dana Levin'
Cc: 'eugeneconwayesq@gmail.com'
Subject: RE: People v. Curtis McDaniels Ind. No. 1302/2016 - 30.30 minutes question

I want to update the Court in advance of tomorrow's appearance: I am still waiting on minutes from several reporters and I believe that the Court will need the minutes from at least two or three of those dates (2015 calendar calls) before being able to render a decision. The People will also be ready for the hearings tomorrow and I will leave it to Mr. Conway and to the Court regarding whether to proceed with the hearings with this 30.30 motion still outstanding.

Thank you.

Ben Levin
Assistant District Attorney
New York County District Attorney's Office
80 Centre Street, Room 700E
New York, NY 10013
(p): (212) 335-3606
(f): (212) 335-4168

From: Dana Levin [mailto:dlevin@nycourts.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019 4:42 PM
To: Levin, Benjamin <LevinB@dany.nyc.gov>
Cc: 'eugeneconwayesq@gmail.com' <eugeneconwayesq@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: People v. Curtis McDaniels Ind. No. 1302/2016 - 30.30 minutes question

The court will have to review the submissions before making a determination on whether minutes are necessary.

From: Levin, Benjamin <LevinB@dany.nyc.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2019 5:10 PM
To: Dana Levin <dlevin@nycourts.gov>
Cc: 'eugeneconwayesq@gmail.com' <eugeneconwayesq@gmail.com>
Subject: People v. Curtis McDaniels Ind. No. 1302/2016 - 30.30 minutes question

Dana,

The above case is on the Court's calendar for hearings and for decision on defendant's pro se 30.30 motion that was adopted by Mr. Conway on the last court date. Mr. Conway and I will both be ready for the hearings. The reason that the case is on for hearings is because of Mr. Conway's trial schedule and because this is going to be a hearings dispositive case because of a recent 1st Department case that will likely cause the hearing judge to suppress the guns that are the subject of this indictment.

I am writing to the Court because I will not be able to receive certain minutes from calendar calls on different dates before the decision date. However, this is not the first 30.30 motion that was filed in this case – Judge Scherzer issued a Decision on a prior 30.30 motion that was filed by one of the defendant's prior attorneys that found that there were 60 days chargeable to the People between May 5, 2016 and October 3, 2018 (the Decision is attached to this email).

Case 1:19-cv-11265-AT-RWL Document 20 Filed 01/08/21 Page 41 of 61

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 61 of 94

However, that Decision did not account for any potential chargeable time before the arraignment on this superseding indictment (the defendant was originally indicted under Indictment # 02635/2015). Ms. Henderson, the defendant's prior attorney, was offered the chance to file a supplemental 30.30 motion to challenge the chargeable time on the first indictment and in her supplemental motion, acknowledged to the Court that the case was not beyond the permitted 30.30 time. See attached email from Ms. Boyar regarding this issue.

My preliminary (and nonbinding) count of chargeable time on the first indictment is 98 days. Those 98 days, when added to the 60 chargeable days in Judge Scherzer's Decision, equals 158 days.

There are no chargeable days between October 3, 2018 to date either because the People have either been ready, defense counsel requested and the Court ordered a 730 exam, because the case was put into a motion schedule, or because the defendant fired his previous attorney before the Court appointed Mr. Conway as the most recent attorney.

I am prepared to put the above information (and address each adjournment that was not already ruled on by Judge Scherzer) in writing in a formal response that I can imminently file, but I want to confirm that the Court can render a Decision on September 5th without having the minutes from the court dates during the first indictment and the minutes from the court dates since the date that Judge Scherzer issued the October 3, 2018 decision.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ben Levin
Assistant District Attorney
New York County District Attorney's Office
80 Centre Street, Room 700E
New York, NY 10013
(p): (212) 335-3606
(f): (212) 335-4168

This email communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the New York County District Attorney's Office and are intended solely for the use of the individuals or entity to whom it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return email.

Please be CAREFUL when clicking links or opening attachments from external senders.

Case 1:19-cv-11265-AT-RWL Document 20 Filed 01/08/21 Page 38 of 61

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 58 of 94

From: Diana Boyar
To: Levin, Benjamin
Cc: "scalesofjustice@yahoo.net"; Hon. Ann E. Scherzer
Subject: RE: Curtis McDaniels Ind. No. 1306/2016 - adj date 11/29/18
Date: Monday, November 19, 2018 2:44:28 PM

Since the defendant is argues that CPL 30.30 time has not expired the People are not required to file a supplemental reply.

From: Levin, Benjamin <LevinB@nyc.nyc.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 2:38 PM
To: Diana Boyar <dboyar@nycourts.gov>
Cc: 'scalesofjustice@yahoo.net' <scalesofjustice@yahoo.net>
Subject: Curtis McDaniels Ind. No. 1306/2016 - adj date 11/29/18

Judge Scherzer,

On October 3, 2018, the Court adjourned this case for defense counsel to file a supplemental 30.30 motion because defendant's first motion to dismiss pursuant to CPL 30.30 did not address any potential chargeable time on the original Indictment in this case (Ind. No. 2635/2015); defendant's motion only addressed chargeable time on the superseding indictment (Ind. No. 1302/2016).

Defendant filed a supplemental CPL 30.30 motion on October 10, 2018. However, in defendant's motion papers, defendant does not allege that CPL 30.30 has been violated, as defendant asked for an order granting "[a] calculation of C.P.L. 30.30 time pursuant to C.P.L. 30.30(1)." See Defendant's CPL 30.30 Motion, dated October 10, 2018 at P.1. Further, in defendant's motion, defendant's own calculation of the CPL 30.30 time in this case indicates that "this case does not require dismissal at this time because the 30.30 time or 180 days has not elapsed." See Defendant's CPL 30.30 Motion, dated October 10, 2018 at P.2. It should also be noted that the People do not agree with defendant's assertion regarding the chargeable CPL 30.30 time.

Defendant has the initial burden to allege that the People have exceeded the permissible CPL 30.30 time. See People v. Goode, 87 N.Y.2d 1045 (1996) ("A defendant seeking a speedy trial dismissal pursuant to CPL 30.30 meets his or her initial burden on the motion simply 'by alleging only that the prosecution failed to declare readiness within the statutorily prescribed time period' (quoting People v. Lupeton, 85 N.Y.2d 71, 77-78; 1995). Defendant failed to meet his initial burden on the motion based on the wording of defendant's motion.

Therefore, it is the People's position that because defendant does not allege a CPL 30.30 violation that it would be premature for the People to respond to this supplemental motion.

In the event that the Court would like a substantive response from the People in advance of the decision date on 11/29/18, the People want to inform the Court that we are awaiting minutes from a calendar call that were ordered in an expedited fashion. We expect to receive those minutes in the next few days and once we receive those minutes, I will be able to file and serve a substantive response in advance of the decision date, in the event that the Court would like the People to

Case 1:19-cv-11265-AT-RWL Document 20 Filed 01/08/21 Page 39 of 61

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 59 of 94

respond substantively despite the fact that defendant does not allege that this case should be dismissed pursuant to CPL 30.30.

Sincerely,

Ben Levin
Assistant District Attorney
New York County District Attorney's Office
80 Centre Street, Room 700E
New York, NY 10013
(p): (212) 335-3606
(f): (212) 335-4168

This email communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the New York County District Attorney's Office and are intended solely for the use of the individuals or entity to whom it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return email.

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 54 of 94
8/22

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

TAP-A JUL 24 2018

X

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Plaintiff,

CPL 30.30 MOTION

CURTIS MCDANIELS,

IND. NO. 1302/2016

Defendant.

X

That upon the annexed affirmation of Lynne Troy Henderson, attorney for the Defendant, and in part TAP A, on August 22, 2018 or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, in the Courthouse located at 100 Centre Street, New York, New York, for an order granting:

Dismissal of the Accusatory Instrument pursuant to C.P.L. 30.30

(1) (b); and

Such other and further relief as to the Court may seem just and proper.

No previous application for the relief sought herein has been made to any court.

DATED: July 17, 2018

New York, New York

Yours, etc.,

Lynne T. Henderson

TO: Hon. Cyrus R. Vance, Jr.
District Attorney
ADA Justin Tatham
New York County
Of Counsel

Lynne T. Henderson
Attorney for the Defendant

Tel. Phone No. 646-266-9977

RECEIVED
MOTION UNIT
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
NEW YORK CITY
JUL 24 2018

Case 1:19-cv-11265-AT-RWL Document 20 Filed 01/08/21 Page 36 of 61

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 55 of 94

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK-PART TAP A

RECEIVED
MOTIONS UNIT

X 2018 OCT 17 A 947

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
NEW YORK COUNTY

Plaintiff,

CPL 30.30 MOTION

CURTIS McDANIELS,

IND. NO. 2635/2015

Defendant.

X

That upon the annexed affirmation of Lynne Troy Henderson, attorney for the Defendant, and in part TAP A, on November 29, 2018 or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, in the Courthouse located at 100 Centre Street, New York, New York, for an order granting:

A calculation of C.P.L. 30.30 time pursuant to C.P.L. 30.30 (1);

and

Such other and further relief as to the Court may seem just and proper.

No previous application for the relief sought herein has been made to any court.

DATED: October 10, 2018
New York, New York

Yours, etc.,

Lynne T. Henderson

Lynne T. Henderson
Attorney for the Defendant

Tel. Phone No. 646-266-9977

TO: Hon. Cyrus R. Vance, Jr.
District Attorney
ADA Benjamin Levin
New York County
Of-Counsel

Case 1:19-cv-11265-AT-RWL Document 20 Filed 01/08/21 Page 37 of 61

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 56 of 94

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK, PART TAP A

X

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

— vs. —

CURTIS McDANIELS,
Defendant.

AFFIRMATION
AS TO 30.30 TIME
Ind. No. 2635/15

X

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) Ss.:
 COUNTY OF NEW YORK)

Lynne T. Henderson, being duly admitted to practice before the Courts of the State of New York, affirms under the penalty of perjury that:

I am counsel for the Defendant in the above-captioned action. I am fully familiar with the facts of this case. This Affirmation and Memorandum of Law is made upon information and belief. Unless otherwise noted, all factual allegations set forth in this Affirmation are based upon my review of the Court file.

The defendant is charged with Criminal Possession Of A Weapon In The Second Degree, P.L. Sec. 265.03 (1) (b).

A previous 30.30 Motion was filed on or about Sept. 18, 2018 as to the superceding indictment in this case, Ind. No. 1302/2016, and by order of the court dated October 3, 2018 which found that 60 days were chargeable to the People.

The defendant was arrested and arraigned in Criminal Court on approximately July 14, 2015.

Case 1:19-cv-11265-AT-RWL Document 20 Filed 01/08/21 Page 47 of 61

Case 1:19-cv-11265-LLS Document 9 Filed 04/13/20 Page 24 of 94

Oxygen

Recovery Group

March 19, 2019

Curtis McDaniel,
2745 Frederick
Douglas Blvd Apt 2C
NEW YORK, NY
10039

Oxygen Account: 000053068
Creditor: RH 2546 7th Ave LP
Principle: \$6,600.00

Dear Curtis McDaniel,

Please find attached documents validating the debt due to RH 2546 7th Ave LP. Your account has been noted as disputed in our system. Please mail in your payment today to this agency.

If you wish to pay by phone, please call (845)367-4330 Ext: 209. You may pay online, by going to: www.paymycreditor.com and follow the prompts. If you have any further questions, please call this office.

This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. This is a communication from a debt collector. NYC DCA # 1471397.

Regards,

James Smith
Oxygen Recovery Group
(845)367-4330 x 209

Transactions

Date Range: All

Date	Reference	Description	Comment	Amount	Balance
12/30/07		Security Deposits		-1,600.00	1,600.00
12/30/07		Security Deposit Adjustment	Tenant Import	-1,600.00	0.00
07/01/15		Rent Charge		1,600.00	1,600.00
08/01/15		Rent Charge		-1,600.00	0.00
09/01/15		Rent Charge		1,600.00	4,800.00
09/03/15	CH#0994	Rent Adjustment		-2,000.00	2,800.00
10/01/15		Rent Charge		1,600.00	4,400.00
10/06/15	CH#10996	Rent Adjustment		-2,000.00	2,400.00
11/01/15		Rent Charge		1,600.00	4,000.00
11/06/15	CH#10996	Rent Adjustment		-2,000.00	2,000.00
12/01/15		Rent Charge		1,600.00	3,600.00
12/11/15	CH#10997	Rent Adjustment		-2,000.00	1,600.00
01/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	3,200.00
02/01/16		Rent Charge		-1,600.00	1,600.00
03/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	6,400.00
04/01/16		Rent Charge		-1,600.00	8,000.00
05/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	9,600.00
06/01/16	CH#01D2056371	Rent Adjustment		-800.00	8,800.00
05/10/16	MO 2343754807B	Rent Adjustment		-1,000.00	7,800.00
06/10/16	MO 10723806412	Rent Adjustment		-1,000.00	6,800.00
05/10/16	MO 10723806412	Rent Adjustment		-1,000.00	5,800.00
05/10/16	MO 10723806413	Rent Adjustment		1,000.00	4,800.00
06/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	6,400.00
05/17/16	CH#01D2109783	Rent Adjustment		-1,600.00	4,800.00
07/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	6,400.00
08/01/16		Rent Charge		-1,600.00	8,000.00
09/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	9,600.00
09/01/16	MO 10752438432	Rent Adjustment		-800.00	7,800.00
09/07/16	MO 10752438433	Rent Adjustment		1,600.00	9,400.00
10/01/16		Rent Charge		-1,600.00	7,800.00
10/18/16	CH#9102139996	Rent Adjustment		-1,600.00	9,400.00
11/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	11,000.00
12/01/16		Rent Charge		1,600.00	12,600.00
12/09/16	CH#9102293907	Rent Adjustment		-2,000.00	10,600.00
01/01/17		Rent Charge		1,600.00	9,400.00
01/22/17	EMO - 1076242851	Payment Received		1,000.00	8,400.00
01/22/17	EMO - 107624231	Payment Received		-600.00	7,800.00
02/01/17		Rent Charge		1,600.00	9,400.00
03/01/17		Rent Charge		1,600.00	11,000.00
04/01/17		Rent Charge		-1,600.00	12,600.00
05/01/17		Rent Charge		1,600.00	14,200.00
05/25/17		Security Deposits	Evicted 5/25	-12,600.00	0.00
05/25/17		Bad Debt	Evicted 5/25		

BARE HILL CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
CALLER BOX 20, 181 BRAND ROAD
MALONE, NEW YORK 12953

Pm. 20AO2412 Curtis McDonel

Bare Hill



NEOPOST

04/26/2021

US POSTAGE \$001.80

ZIP 12953
041M11277530

Pro Se Intake Unit
500 Pearl Street
New York, N.Y. 10007

ED
MAIL

Legal
Mail

RECEIVED
SDNY FPO SE OFFICE
2021 APR 28 PM 2:29

